

September 29, 1967

Messrs. Harrington
Old

Re: Tobacco Institute (Tiderock Corporation)

There was a meeting this morning of the Executive Committee of The Tobacco Institute which Mr. Old attended with me. Also in attendance were Mr. Finch and his counsel, James Ravlin; Mr. Gallaway of Reynolds and his counsel, Mr. Ramm; Mr. Cullman of Philip Morris and his counsel, Paul Smith; Brooks George of Larus Brothers; Mr. Louis A. Bantle, President of United States Tobacco Company and Senator Clements.

Senator Clements stated that he had followed the directions of the Executive Committee at their last meeting and had talked with Rosser Reeves, the head of Tiderock, and that Tiderock could operate well within the unexpended Hill & Knowlton projection for the remainder of this year, but that annual charges for rental, salaries of a staff of eleven, administrative costs and a fee would run between \$340,000 and \$350,000 per year. No projects would be put into operation which require any substantial expenditure without prior approval of the Executive Committee. No one knows what the additional cost, over and above overhead, will be per annum, but the Executive Committee will have control of this since any substantial expenditure for particular projects must be approved.

It was agreed that the Institute would retain the services of Tiderock for the remainder of 1967 and for the year 1968. Mr. Old did meet Mr. Reeves and his public relations assistant, Reginald Wells, and I do suggest that you should call Mr. Reeves and make arrangements to meet him. Everybody seems to be quite hopeful that he can be helpful.

Within the next three to four weeks, Tiderock will be in a position to make specific suggestions in order to project the industry's side of the smoking and health controversy. The suggested program will probably include:

1. Attracting the medical profession to our side of the controversy and to the fact that a controversy exists. Some thought is being given to speeches before county medical societies.
2. Obtaining publication of industry oriented articles in first rate publications. Reeves has already

LG 2022956

116 81043

7-

obtained the consent of Esquire to carry an article in February, with the possible condition that Emerson Foote would write a reply in a later edition.

3. Picking out one or more small communities and sampling a cross section of the population as to their attitudes on smoking and health, several weeks after which an ad or article stating our position would be run. After a realistic waiting period, another sampling of attitudes would be taken. If this proves out, we would have a basis for a more widespread campaign.
4. Preparation of a film which might take an hour to present our side of the story over Channel 13 or other educational networks. Reeves is sure this can be done.
5. Preparation of a motion picture film for use in public theatres in the place of a double feature. Mr. Wells has had considerable experience in this respect and is quite sure that this can be accomplished as part of a package which will permit theatres to turn over audiences more frequently.
6. Pursuit of a convocation of medical experts from many countries who would discuss our side of the smoking and health controversy and thus perhaps counter the World Conference recently held.

* * * * *

Discussion was had as to what the industry might do to improve its position in the statistical area. I stated what Dr. Kensler and Dr. Bates have thought for some time; namely, attempting to acquire Hammond's data for multivariate analysis, thus reducing gross statistical associations to net associations. I also mentioned that Kensler thinks that we should consider starting a statistical study of persons on the U. S. twin registry and that this could well show that one's physiological makeup determines smoking habits and disease rather than smoking.

Mr. Old was quite firm in stating that he doubted whether Arthur D. Little should conduct such continuing studies because of its long association with this Company. This was understood by others present, but it was generally agreed that at least Dr. Kensler should be invited to the next Executive Committee meeting to discuss the nature of the studies he has in mind. If the Executive Committee favors going forward and the data is available, there are others than Arthur D. Little who can do the work.